

*Sir
Edward
Peacock
Fund*

This book was selected by
J.A.W. GUNN,
Sir Edward Peacock
Professor of Political Studies

Queen's University Libraries



COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

A Word to the
HUTCHINSONIANS:

Or REMARKS on

Three extraordinary Sermons

Lately preached before

The UNIVERSITY of OXFORD,

BY

The Reverend Dr. PATTEN,

The Reverend Mr. WETHERALL,

AND

The Reverend Mr. HORNE.

BY

A MEMBER of the UNIVERSITY.

Above all these things put on CHARITY, which is the bond of perfectness. And——let the word of CHRIST dwell in you, richly, in ALL WISDOM: teaching and ADMONISHING one another. Coloss. iii. 14, 16.

L O N D O N :

Printed; and sold by *R. Doddsley*, in Pall Mall; *R. Griffiths*,
in Pater-Noster-Row: and *J. Fletcher* in Oxford.

MDCCLVI.

AC 917. 1956. K46

REMARKS

ON THE

THREE SERMONS.

IT may, I presume, be laid down as a maxim of indisputable truth, That every member of a Society should contribute his best endeavours to serve that Society, to which he belongs: and that the exertion of this service will be the more necessary, and therefore a matter of stronger duty; in proportion as the Society is of greater consequence, and as any danger that threatens its prosperity becomes more apparent and more alarming.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, of which I have the honour to be a member, is certainly one of the most important Societies in these kingdoms. And, as long as true Religion and sound Learning shall continue to be there studiously inculcated; it will ever deserve, and will (I trust) ever receive protection and encouragement from all ranks and degrees of men. But then, in order to secure to itself its proper happiness, arising from the opinion amongst wise and good men of its real utility; it behoves this Society constantly to remember, that its business is to teach *true Religion and sound Learning*, to cultivate and encourage these with

zeal regulated by knowledge, and to animadvert on such performances as tend to injure its fame—either, by misrepresenting pure Religion—or, by being dogmatical in Science falsely so call'd—or, by decrying human Learning and the light of Reason, and consequently contributing to the discredit of Christianity ; since Christianity can only be explain'd properly by human Learning, and defended effectually by human Reason.

A new sect of Gentlemen has sprung up of late years, and is well known in this University by the name of HUTCHINSONIANS, as being the disciples of one *Mr. Hutcheson*. These Gentlemen offer themselves to the world, in the honourable character of *Reformers* ; and an honourable character it certainly is in itself—because, in any age and much more in *this*, nothing should recommend more effectually than zeal to attempt any instance of public reformation, if accompanied with knowledge to plan and execute it properly.

The scheme of reformation, enter'd upon by the founder of this sect, related to the *original language of the Old Testament* and *the true sense of the Bible*. For the Hebrew language, it should seem, had been lamentably misunderstood, and the genuine meaning of both the Old and New Testaments dangerously conceal'd ; till there arose, in the 18th century, this great champion of truth and revelation, this original in the discovery of roots physical and theological. To this first scheme of the founder, for a reformation in *Scripture Learning*, his followers have superadded a zeal for reformation in *Practical Religion*. Schemes these—very important in their nature, in all places
and

and particularly in an University ; and which, if rationally conducted, certainly deserve the highest encouragement. And indeed, tho' these schemers should prove mistaken in the means, yet if they were honest as to the end, and propos'd their opinions with a modest candor and in the spirit of Christian Charity ; they would be entitled, at least, to the pardon of the community.

But, every public Reformer in *Learning* should certainly be *a man of Learning* ; and every public Reformer in *Religion* should be (in these days) *a man of Religion* and *a man of Learning* likewise.

A little learning is a dangerous thing.

For if a little learning and a great deal of conceit should prompt a man abusively to censure his superiors for not patronizing, and his equals for not encouraging, his own crude notions ; should prompt him insolently to prescribe to the world wrong systems of science and (what may emphatically be call'd) vain philosophy ; the consequence must be, that men truly learned will express their contempt at this manifestation of vanity and impertinence in the dictator. Again : if there does not appear, amongst the reformers in *Religion*, a conscientious regard to Moral and Christian Duties ; and also such a knowledge of the Bible and of the World, as qualifies them to apply the instructions of the one to the wants of the other ; instead of reforming mankind, they will furnish out entertainment for Infidels, they will weaken the power of that Religion they profess to venerate, and they will establish nothing but *their own disgrace* and *the disgrace of the Society* with which they are connected. As

As to the latter article, that must be understood conditionally. For, if that Society in general, and the Governors of it in particular, should shew a public disapprobation of such wrong notions and wrong practices, and should discountenance these mistaken reformers themselves, as well as strive to prevent their making profelytes amongst the young and injudicious ; in such a case, it would be the misfortune, but not the fault, of a Society to have such members in it. On the contrary : if favour should be shewn such members by the Society in general ; or, if the Governors in particular should do them honour, by advancing THEM to the public pulpit, as the Oracles of the University, on days of more than ordinary solemnity ; what a triumph will be hereby granted to the Enemies of the University, and how shall its warmest Friends stand forth effectually in its Vindication ?

The behaviour of the *Hutchinsonian* Divines, in this University and in other parts of the kingdom, is now become matter of general complaint—the general complaint of men truly respectable, as Scholars and as Christians. And indeed, very uncomfortable effects must attend the preaching Christianity in this new-fangled garb of it ; when so many Christians (sincerely dispos'd to learn *what they must do to be saved*) are told by these men, with the most assuming decisiveness, that *They, and They only, are the servants of the most high God, which shew forth the way of salvation !* I repeat, that very uncomfortable effects must follow, from their labouring to discredit all other preachers of the Gospel, and vilifying all methods
of

of illustrating the doctrines and enforcing the duties of Christianity, that do not square with their novelty of conception and their quaintness of expression.

Is there not then an alarm loudly sounded to the friends of Religion—when congregations in divers places are assur'd, that Christianity can only be defended by the new lights of this or that *Hutchinsonian* preacher ; at the same time, that persons of sense see Religion plac'd by these men on a foundation of sand, and taken from off that rock which has supported the sacred edifice for ages—when these preachers dare to deny the very existence of Moral Duties, in order to exalt Christian Virtues ; and, under pretence of glorifying Revelation, insult and trample upon Reason, tho' the latter is also the gift of God, communicated in a different manner to his Creatures—in short : when men step forth public Reformers in *Learning*, with no other qualification than the contempt of it ; yet making ample amends for the low esteem entertain'd for them amongst others by the exaltation of themselves and one another : and when they appear as public Reformers in *Religion*, with (I will not say, *not more veracity*, because veracity is a Moral Duty, and Morality is not within the new system, but with) no recommendation above others, excepting the appearance of greater zeal with the certainty of less knowledge.

The Metropolis of this kingdom has, of late years, furnish'd ample matter for these untoward reflections. But we need not go beyond the bounds of our own University, to discover a foundation for very great uneasiness, and also for this
humble

humble attempt to awaken the attention of the Governors of our University to the nature and consequences of this growing evil. It is not my present design, to animadvert on this kind of preaching, as occasionally admitted here into private Churches; tho' I could furnish the reader with many strange explanations of Scripture there deliver'd, besides that very late one, which extracted *Christianity* out of *Samson's Riddle*. Nor shall I consider this kind of preaching, as establish'd here in one Parish Church in particular; where the Congregation, tho' in general greatly surpris'd, were lately struck, in a very uncommon manner, by some reflections upon the conduct of a certain Society in the *propagation* of Religion. But I only intend, at present, to express my surprize at the sermons frequently preach'd of late before THIS UNIVERSITY—before a Body of Men, justly held honourable thro' many centuries, for their cultivation of true Religion and also of sound Learning. Nor shall I expatiate here on the sermons of all these *Hutchinsonian* or *Enthusiastic* New-Reformers. But, after some remarks upon Two of them, I shall proceed to consider more at large a Third, which was the chief occasion of these reflections; and which (after having been preach'd *before the University of Oxford*, after having been preach'd *before the Mayor and Corporation of Oxford*, and after having been preach'd *at several other places*—as the author himself informs us) has just made its public appearance, printed at *the Theatre in Oxford*.

The first sermon then, which I shall here take notice of (as being prior in order of time) was preach'd before this University on *Asc-Sunday* last; and, after several months revisal, has been lately laid before the world. Its title page tells us, it was *publish'd at the request of the Vice-Chancellor and OTHER Heads of Houses*; and this new stile, in the form of the request, has occasion'd many an enquiry amongst the curious, as to the cause and meaning of it. But, as I don't apprehend there were present with Mr. Vice-Chancellor, at the time this request was propos'd, any other Heads of Houses than *one head of a ball*; I confess myself unequal to the solution of this very odd phænomenon.

This sermon is entitled, *The Christian Apology*. And as to its author, *the Rev. Dr. Patten*, I shall only say—that, tho' he is perhaps endow'd with a greater share of Learning than both the other Gentlemen, he seems to hold it in more sovereign contempt than either of them. And how is every reader surpriz'd at this Doctor's contemptuous treatment of Learning, particularly in page the 7th; and at his sarcastical application of "*inter sylvas academi!*" especially, as the day, on which he had been selected for preaching this sermon, was our *Anniversary* for inculcating the advantages, or rather the necessity of Learning, in the search after Truth, and consequently in the cause of Religion!

The text chose, on so particular an occasion, was—*Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear*: &c. words, which

have been generally, if not universally, consider'd as directly repugnant to this Anti-Literary system; and *as exhorting Christians to acquaint themselves with the true grounds and reasons of their Religion, and to be always ready modestly to communicate them in order to silence and convert their enemies.* And, if this was the duty of the first Christians, in the days of persecution; and if this be the duty of common Christians now, in the way of private conversation; is it not naturally inferr'd to be the duty of the learned, to communicate these reasons publickly and in print?

But the preceding exposition, however greatly countenanc'd, has fail'd (not, I hope, because greatly countenanc'd) to please this singular Divine. He gives another sense of the words; which, notwithstanding the cloud of witnesses that appears against him, he pronounces to be *the true and genuine sense*, and that **INDISPUTABLY**—as if there never had been one single protest enter'd against it! But, as there have been, so will there still continue to be, Dissentients; after all the difficulties enumerated by the Doctor as attending the common interpretation, and after all his arguments in support of his own novel notion: which (if I may use his own words, p. 15) *is twirl'd over with the same smile of pity, which this enlighten'd writer has bestow'd on the opinions of other men.*

The Doctor has condescended to exhibit one specimen of human Learning; but, as he can hardly be suppos'd to have done this *with a willing mind*, 'tis no wonder he has succeeded so ill in it. **ΑΙΤΕΡΤΙ** (says he, p. 4) *not arrogantly demanding*

(Is this the present rendering?) but *asking, requesting*; and, to render this sense here the more plausible, he leaves out the *seven* intervening words, and gives us αἰτῶντι μετὰ πρᾶϋτητος καὶ φόβου, as words immediately connected with one another! But, what say other men of learning? Let us take *Mintert's Lexicon*: Αἰτέω, *peto, rogo, exigo, postulo*; item, *accuso et ad judicem provooco, sc. ad inquirendum accusatum*—senses, which are remarkably pertinent to the word in this place, as will soon be prov'd.

The Doctor is also pleas'd to affirm, that Λόγος NEVER *signifieth* A REASON, in the sense which that word beareth in our bible translation of this verse. But I must ask his pardon for affirming the contrary; and that, upon the authority of St. Luke. The sense, which that word bears in this verse, is *a reason, or an account, by way of defence*. And we need refer only to one text of Scripture, which seems (if I may use the Doctor's own word) *indisputably* decisive, for the very same sense. *Acts* xix. 40. *We are in danger to be called in question for this day's uproar; there being no cause whereby we may give Λόγον an account (a reason, a defence) of this concourse.*

And now, as to the capital criticism; the connecting *meekness and fear* with the persons *asking* an apology: this seems absolutely irreconcilable with the context. For the Doctor pronounces the persons, here spoke of as *asking*, to be *sincere, ingenuous, modest enquirers*; whereas St. Peter evidently speaks of them, as *false accusers and persecuting governors*. For, in the verse immediately preceding, the Apostle says—*But if ye suffer for*

righteousness sake, happy are ye ; and be not afraid of their terror, neither be ye troubled. And in the verse immediately following—*Having a good conscience, that whereas they speak evil of you, as of evil doers, they may be ashamed, when they falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.* So that the *meekness and fear* (after all the demonstration of conviction to the contrary) are here recommended to the Christians who were to make, and not to their Heathen enemies who might demand, the Christian Apology. And, as it was a matter of moment, that this Doctrine should have been observ'd strictly, when the enemies of Christianity were at first numerous and powerful ; so is it particularly seasonable to be again inculcated at present—whether we attend to the late alarming encrease of Infidelity ; or to the dictatorial, abusive, uncharitable mode of preaching amongst these New-Reformers, void of *meekness* and void of *fear*.

But (in the words of our author) *whatever may become of this remark ; yet some surprize must be express'd at the general nature and tendency of his sermon—which may be call'd a declamation concerning Reason and concerning Religion ; or rather, a doubtful disputation upon the propriety and necessity of reasoning in Religion, and the propriety and necessity of not reasoning in Religion.* For, as to the propriety and necessity of reasoning in Religion, this he expressly allows, in p. 29 ; where he admits, that *the gospel needeth reasonings.* And when he admits, in p. 11, that, by way of apology for Christianity, there must be *an allegation of miracles and prophecies ;* certainly he cannot mean, that these miracles and prophecies prove them-

themselves; or, that they are to be prov'd and apply'd, without reasoning upon their certainty, nature, and tendency; or, that the short argument *IT IS WRITTEN* (which he so pompously holds forth, in p. 23.) can possibly be satisfactory to *UNBELIEVERS*, without adding *where, when, by whom, and by what authority*, (it is written) with the proper vouchers upon each article, and each voucher supported by sound argument. And yet, secondly, as to the propriety and necessity of *not reasoning* in Religion; he (p. 12.) *arms the Christian warrior to the overthrow of reasonings*; and (p. 11) calls abstract reasoning *the very province of the Devil*.

But if reasoning be here ascrib'd, without a compliment, to *the Devil* as its proper lord and master; why would this Divine be so express in favour of *miracles and prophecies*, which can only be ascertain'd and apply'd properly by reasoning thereupon? And, on the other hand, if reasoning be useful and necessary for the defence of Christianity; why would he be so declamatory against reasoning—against the arts and the place, which teach reasoning professedly—and against that late Right Reverend Author (whom this Gentleman affects to call *a writer of some note*) who has exercis'd his superior faculty of reasoning, in defence of Revelation, with a meekness in the manner almost beyond example, and with a force in the arguments that is irresistible—A DEFENCE! that will be a lasting monument of Fame to its great Author; and of which scarce any thing more honourable can be said, than that it is particularly
insulted

insulted by those Gentlemen who are profess'd enemies to human reasoning.

I shall only add here: if (as the Doctor allows, p. 11) *unbelievers will attack Christianity by reasonings drawn from all the sources of human learning*; shall WE likewise say, that CHRISTIANITY IS NOT FOUNDED ON ARGUMENT? Is Christianity to be given up, as *irrational*? Shall it be own'd *indefensible* against such attacks? If not, it must be defended likewise by reasonings drawn from all the sources of human learning—agreeably to St. Paul's advice to Titus, *that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed*, (ii. 8)—agreeably to his exhortation to every Christian Bishop, *that he may convince the gainsayers; for there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, whose mouths must be stopped*, (i. 9—11)—and agreeably to the same Apostle, in his epistle to the Colossians, (iv. 5, 6) where, having spoke of his own preaching the Gospel, he adds, *Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, τον καιρον εξαγοραζομενοι*, (redeeming, purchasing, earnestly seizing the opportunity) *let your speech be alway with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how to answer every man*. With these Apostolical authorities I shall conclude my remarks on this Gentleman's performance, on this *new* kind of an Apology for Christianity, an Apology independent of all the arts of reasoning. And it will be but decent to leave *him*, in the plenary possession of that indulgence which he has generously vouchsaf'd to others (p. 20); namely, that he continue to *take delight in this his romantic scenery, and amuse himself with contemplating and arranging his own flimsy creation*.

From

From the performance of this Gentleman, who possibly may not call himself an *Hutchinsonian*, (tho' I have presum'd to introduce him here, from a similitude both in *the Letter* and *Spirit* of his sermon to those of that Brotherhood) I proceed to the sermon of *the Rev. Mr. Wetherall*; who probably would take it ill, if he was not complimented as one of *Mr. Hutchinson's* disciples. This Gentleman was appointed to preach before our University, on the last 30th day of January. But, as his Sermon has not been (*yet*) made more public, than by being preach'd before such an Audience, fewer remarks must of course be made upon it: tho' the subject matter of it was equally curious with the foregoing, and the preacher was truly wonderful in the double character of Politician and Divine. Fame says, that one of the Brotherhood, on that very same day, told *his* audience—that *the 30th of January was a day, on which every Clergyman should speak his mind*, (pity, that every day was not, in this respect, a 30th of January)—that *he would speak his mind*—and that *he had taken advice about it*. One could wish, that our University preacher had acted with equal prudence, and *taken advice* likewise. For surely any counsellor, moderately vers'd in the history of King Charles the 1st, would have set him right in some of the *Facts*, which he so stoutly asserted to the great astonishment of the Congregation. I leave those Facts to be particulariz'd, when he shall have favour'd the public with his sermon; which, if printed, will (I dare infer from the *fortitude* of the preacher) be printed exactly

exactly as it was preach'd: for as much as *no sermon, that is alter'd, can strictly be call'd the same*. I don't give this maxim, as an extraordinary discovery; but, however obvious, it may possibly have its uses.

It was indeed surprizing (tho' we were in expectation of *the marvelous*) to hear the preacher maintain the justly-exploded doctrine of *absolute passive obedience*, and this in terms so extremely gross, as even to have out—*Filmer'd Filmer*: to maintain it to be the indispensable duty of all Christian subjects, under the worst of tyrants, to bow down in the dust or upon the block; and patiently to permit him to ravish from them Religion, Liberty, Property, and Life itself—and, at last, to tell the Congregation, that no man could vindicate Resistance in any case whatsoever, without giving up all regard for the Bible, and all pretension to common Sense!

Were this wild doctrine true; how will the preacher vindicate obedience to His Majesty King GEORGE, so eminently the Father of his People? For, if a reigning Family cannot forfeit a right to govern; can it cease to be the duty of a Nation to obey? And if the *Stuart* Family, which now claims these kingdoms upon this preacher's principles, claims them rightfully; does not every British Subject act wrongfully, in not attempting another Restoration? But (as in order to expose absurdities one may have recourse to contradictions) how can any Englishman, with this preacher's principles, vindicate the lawfulness of another Restoration? Are not those principles express'd properly thus—*absolute obedience to the powers that be*;

be ; to the supreme power, that is, at any time, and by any means, establish'd? If so ; can there be such a thing as Usurpation? At least, must not every Usurper of government, as being *the Power that is*, be obey'd absolutely? If so ; Cromwell had as strong a right to the obedience of Britons as King Charles the 1st. Nay ; when Cromwell and his associates were invested with supreme authority ; were not Charles Stuart and all his friends bound, as Christians, to submit absolutely to all the sentences pass'd upon them by *the Powers that then were*? At least ; when the governing power had been lodg'd for years in the hands of Cromwell and his party ; how can the preacher vindicate the Restoration of King Charles the 2d ; this step being evidently an act of Resistance in Englishmen against *the Powers that were then* over them? But, if he justifies the *Restoration* ; can he condemn the *Revolution*? That Glorious REVOLUTION! which, with its full train of national Blessings, enables the British Ministers of the Gospel still to preach the *Protestant* Religion! In short ; if most of the wisest and best men, both Clergy and Laity, in England in general and this University in particular, have determin'd—that Scripture agrees with common sense, in disallowing *absolute passive obedience* ; 'tis really amazing, that a preacher (probably but in *Deacon's* orders) should, when preaching before this University, be so comfortably self-sufficient, as to pay no respect, no deference at all, to so truly venerable an Assembly !

Thus have I presum'd to offer my sentiments on Two sermons, preach'd on Two solemn days, before the University of Oxford only: I say, before this University *only*; because I have never heard, that either of these sermons has been lent out to *the younger members* of the Brotherhood, to procure *them* a character in country places.

I proceed therefore, as before propos'd, to take notice of a Third sermon, which may be presum'd to be of more general emolument than the former Two; as the Rev. *Mr. Horne*, its author, has himself preach'd it (as the title page informs us) *before the University of Oxford, before the Mayor and Corporation of Oxford, and at several other places*—perhaps, instead of *at several other places*, he meant to say, *before several other Societies or Congregations*. I presume by *other places* he means *other places in Oxford*. And the phrase *other places* necessarily implies, that *some* place or places had been mention'd before. But *no place* is previously mention'd; mention being only made of *two Bodies of men or Societies*. Had he said, preach'd *at St. Mary's and at St. Martin's, and several other places*; this would have been sense. But, as the particle *before* signifies *in the presence of*, he could not intend to say in the presence of *a place*, but of *such and such a society*; and consequently, tho' the Societies are mention'd *before whom*, yet the places *where* preach'd being omitted, *at several other places* is certainly bad language, and may be plac'd in the front of the inaccuracies contain'd in this extraordinary sermon. A sermon! which one should rob of its just character, by not adding to the charge of inaccuracy that of absurdity, mis-

appli-

application of holy Scripture, and the truly-*Hutchinsonian* spirit of defamation; and this last finish'd off with the most express violation of Christian Charity: tho' *Charity* be, as our Church rightly affirms, *the very bond of peace and of all virtues; without which whosoever liveth is counted dead before God.*

I have not scrupled to call the errors of this writer by (what I apprehend to be) their proper titles; not only because freedom of speech must be approv'd by every genuine son of *Mr. Hutchinson*; but also, because this pamphlet may possibly have the more weight with those, whom it is meant to alarm and caution against *Hutchinsonianism*. 'The disciples of this new sect insinuate themselves into the good opinion of young Gentlemen by the following pretences—that most other Divines are wicked and profane in their Conduct—or, corrupt in their explanations of Christianity—or, in reality, Unbelievers of Revelation—or, at best, miserably mistaken in their notions of true Philosophy. And as these false and dangerous imputations are urg'd with great appearances of Christian Zeal, and with pretensions to the only Learning worthy of cultivation; I presume, it will not be unserviceable, to animadvert on this sermon, preach'd so frequently, by one of the first class amongst the Brethren: a sermon! which will abundantly prove, that *Hutchinsonianism* is far from being necessarily accompanied with improv'd judgment, since it is here scarce attended with common sense or intelligible language. And the consequence of these reflections will (I hope) be—that, when young Gentlemen are convinc'd

of the gross deficiencies of the pre-eminent writers of this sect; they may be led to suspect the truth of those principles, which are espous'd only by men of *such* judgment—lest, whilst they are flatter'd with the notion of being initiated into *superior wisdom*, they are led to embrace the *foolishness of folly*.

However strong the terms of this charge may appear to some; yet, lest any should apprehend, that these and some other expressions are too severe, and liable to the very same censure pass'd here on these uncharitable Gentlemen; I shall observe to every Reader—That I humbly presume, in order effectually to expose Ignorance, and guard against imposition from it, it should plainly be call'd *Ignorance*; and the more effectually to banish Vice, and prevent its contagion, it should be plainly call'd *Vice*—and, that there is a very wide difference between publicly censuring men as *Infidels* and *Atheists* without proof; and reproving such censurers afterwards, for having notoriously and upon full proof offended either against *Learning*, or against *Religion*, or against *Both*.

Having premis'd this necessary caution, I shall now enter upon the consideration of this Third sermon. The occasion of it (the author tells us somewhat oddly) was *the late Earthquakes and publick Fast*. He does not say, *what* Earthquakes. This would have involv'd him in some difficulty; because, tho' the Fast was partly appointed on account of the late Earthquakes at *Lisbon* and other places near the same time, he had chose a text, some part of which was more applicable to (and therefore he intimates it to be a prophecy of)

the

the two Earthquakes at *London* near seven years before. But this text, happening to have more conveniences than inconveniences, was upon the whole thought very eligible.

It is taken out of *the Revelation of St. John*; which, being the most obscure book in the Bible (perhaps, because the least fulfill'd as yet) is thought by these Gentlemen to open an ample field for *their* types and prophecies and random conjectures. One should here correct a repeated error of this author, who has (at least twice) printed the name of this book *Revelations*. Indeed the unity of any Revelation dissolves, multiplies or divides at pleasure, under the pen of either of these Gentlemen: an instance of which lies just before us, in this author's intimating a prophecy, in one verse, of the Earthquake at *Lisbon* in 1755; and, in the very next verse, of the Earthquakes at *London* in 1749: p. 3, 18. But, as to the orthography of this word; he might have read it in the Greek Αποκαλυψις, and in our English version *Revelation*.

It will be difficult to range the censurable passages of this sermon, under any general classes of objection; and the Reader will the more easily compare the following remarks with the sermon itself, if they proceed in course with the sermon. I have only to add one farther preliminary—to remind the Reader, that the sermon, to be now animadverted upon, is the work of one of the chiefs amongst *those*, who arrogate to themselves *greater Knowledge* as well as *purer Religion*; and who are fond of charging other Ministers of the Gospel both with *Irreligion* and *Ignorance*.

The

The text is, *Rev. xi. 13, 14. And the same hour was there a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city fell, and in the earthquake were slain of men seven thousand: and the remnant were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven. The second woe is past, and behold, the third woe cometh quickly.*

Page 1. *It is an heavy charge brought against some in the psalms*—These words, tho' they begin the sermon, are very imperfect in the language. The author should have said—*brought against some persons spoke of in one of the psalms; or, brought in one of the psalms against certain persons.*

P. 1, 2. *Of all God's works he loved to DISCOURSE, but never did he pour forth more edifying STRAINS, than when in order to chuse and keep in the right way, the judgments of the Almighty were laid before him. Neither Sense, nor English.*

P. 2. *It is the privilege of a Christian soul to draw the water of life from the flinty rock, on the outside of which others fall and are broken; &c.* The ideas of an *Hutchesonian* soul are so wild and uncircumscribable; that, tho' their novelty creates astonishment, their impropriety is not easily expressed, except in the general phrase of being *unintelligible*. If any sense can be discover'd in this sentence, it may be this; that, *whilst wicked men are destroyed, good men are comforted, by the judgments or punishments of God.* But why would this Divine introduce the word *judgments* just before, tho' us'd in a very different meaning? If he knew the necessary distinction; why would he not make it? For *judgments* frequently signify the laws of God, and must be so understood in the very last sentence—*I remembered thine everlasting*
judg-

judgments, O Lord, and received comfort. Ps. cxix. 52. Certainly the psalmist did not receive comfort from remembering God's *everlasting punishments*. And 'tis remarkable, that in this cxixth. psalm, tho' it contains 176 verses, every verse (unless we should except the 122d.) has in it some expression signifying *the law or word of God*.

P. 2, 3. *There seems now to hang a cloud over this nation, ready to break upon it in a storm, unless pierced and scattered by the prayers sent forth from penitent and faithful hearts. While we are musing on such events as these &c.* By this *cloud*, I presume the author means *a French Invasion*. But why would he not be more explicit, as to this alarming danger, in some part or other of his sermon; as this was one of the principal reasons for the solemn Fast? The jumble of ideas, in a *figurative cloud* pierc'd and scatter'd by *real prayers* will strike most readers; as well as the impropriety of calling this *cloud an event*.

P. 3. —*turn away captivity from Jacob.* As he is suppos'd to be here talking of an invasion by the French, in order to restore to these kingdoms the family of *James*, and to deliver *the Jacobites* from what they call *their long captivity*; it has been thought a very unfortunate quotation, when he here speaks of *beseeching the Lord to be gracious unto his land, and turn away CAPTIVITY FROM JACOB*.

P. 3. *Far be it from me presumptuously to attempt prying into the archives of heaven*—It is not easy to see, how this is consistent with presumptuously determining, that *the day of Judgment is very nigh at hand*; as he does in several parts of
this

this sermon, and particularly by inserting the word *shortly* in the last page, and rashly correcting the Liturgy—*We believe that thou shalt shortly come to be our judge.*

P. 4. *To ALL the dwellers upon earth has God spoken—by earthquake.* If he means by the late earthquakes, this assertion seems too extensive by being *universal*. And the same may be said, when we read, p. 7, *the WHOLE body of waters was in agitation.* Tho', as to the former assertion, one knows not what advices our author may have receiv'd from *China*; nor, as to the latter, from *the Pacific Ocean.*

P. 5. Here he proposes to consider first the *author*, and secondly the *cause* of Earthquakes. But is *author* sufficiently distinguish'd here from *cause*? He himself (p. 17.) makes the two words signify just the same; or rather, makes the *cause* to be the *author*—*God not the author of them, but some other cause.* Here he observes, that the author of Earthquakes is neither *chance* nor *nature*. For as to *chance*, he says, *there is no such thing*: so that the first author, improperly so call'd, is nothing. And *nature*, he says, is not the author; because that is not the *first* cause but the *second*: so that, if it had been the *first* cause, it would have been *the author*!

P. 5. *If the Scripture account of the construction of the earth was accurately examined, philosophers might give a rational and defensible account of them.* After having thus properly connected the epithets *rational* and *defensible*, as if nothing was defensible that was not rational; 'tis pity, he should have inserted (p. 16.) the following irony—*at the price*
of

of man's beloved and adored reason. The Scripture is here affirm'd to contain a truly philosophical account of the construction of the Earth; with an intimation, that this author knows it true, upon accurate examination. I confess, I am not prejudiced, at present, in favour of the judgment of those men, who maintain *all arts and sciences* to be contain'd in the Bible. Nor can I apprehend, that any man is to be heard without large grains of allowance, who pronounces the existence of grains of *Darkness*, as well as grains of *Light*; and that grains of *Light* become grains of *Darkness*, when they grow so large as to be invisible! (See *Moses's Principia*, part 2d.) And as to the natural philosophy of the Bible; the single phrase of *the rising of the Sun* convinces me—that the sacred authors did not always write with philosophical accuracy, but frequently express'd themselves according to the common apprehension of things; just as the followers of the immortal NEWTON speak now of *the Sun's rising and setting*, tho' they can demonstrate, that the Sun has no motion, unless round its own axis.

P. 6. *Even he, who dispos'd every EVENT, to perform the part allotted it in his plan, WHICH compos'd the song of the psalmist, of mercy and judgment.* Absolutely unintelligible!

P. 6. *The last chapter in Revelations (Revelation) declares God shall destroy the world.* No such declaration in that chapter.

P. 6. *Depression as well as promotion—a very new antithesis!*

P. 7. *The first Earthquake, recorded in the SS. was at the Flood.* The destruction of the World

by Water is here called *an Earthquake* ; but probably for the very first time : and the description is as wonderful as the assertion—*the waters of the great deep beneath, rising and swelling, burst their way thro' the earth that STANDS upon them, and shook and broke the whole to pieces.* But, not to dwell on this Oratorico-Philosophical description ; I would ask, Does Moses call this an Earthquake ? No ; this is not even pretended. But, it seems, Isaiah alludes to the Flood, when he says (xxiv. 19.) *the foundations of the earth do shake &c.*—a description of distress, which is less likely to allude to the Flood ; because Isaiah says in that very place, *the earth shall fall and not rise again :* which surely was not the case at the Flood.

P. 7. *Behold I (and lest future Infidels should doubt) even I &c.* Here he draws an argument from the repetition of the pronoun, where God speaks of bringing the Flood, to convince *Infidels!* This is truly wonderful ! For, as Infidels deny the authority of the very book, wherein this pronoun is found ; must it not be *indisputably* the same thing to them, whether it occurs once or twice ?

P. 8. *There was one, which the prophet Amos thus foretells.* One what ? Certainly an Earthquake. For, the substantive may be found, if you examine backwards *only* thro' 16 lines : but remote antecedents and distant consequences are no uncommon things with this writer. Be that as it may ; how does Amos foretell this one (Earthquake) ? The words cited, to express this prophecy, are these—*the Lord will roar from Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem, and the habitations of the shepherds shall mourn, and the top of Carmel shall wither !*

P. 8. *An Earthquake made the centurion own the divinity of Christ, when he hung upon the cross; and it won't make Christians own him, tho' he is enthron'd in heaven! Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon! Gently—not so very flaming—let us have a little knowledge with so much zeal. But, what is the cause of all this astonishment and distressful exclamation? why, the Gentleman says, Christians won't own Christ, tho' he is enthron'd in heaven. This is astonishing indeed! But—is it true? Is it possible for a man in his senses, to pronounce (in a Sermon before the University of Oxford) that Christians won't own Christ?—Tell it not in Gath! Publish it not, unless it be publish'd (as at present) in order to chastize ignorance when arm'd with arrogance. The words are express, it won't make Christians own HIM; and by him must be here meant Christ. But what is it, that won't make Christians own Christ? The Earthquake (he says) at the crucifixion. Yes: Christians are led by this Earthquake and the astonishing circumstances attending it, in concurrence with divers other Miracles and from the force of Prophecies, to acknowledge JESUS to be THE CHRIST. The truth is, the Gentleman aims here at something more; but is very unhappy both in his conceit and his expression of it. By owning Christ, he means, owning the Divinity of Christ, owning him equal to God the Father. But, was the Earthquake calculated to prove this? Did it make the centurion own this? Why, yes (he says) it made the centurion own the Divinity of Christ. But, in what sense? why, that he was the Son of God. True; and where is the Christian, that does not own the same?*

P. 9. *Whatever drunken infidels and reprobates may talk, in their abominable clubs, when with their liquor, the devil enters into them, we know, that God's arm is not shorten'd, or he less governor of the world, since he sent his son to save it than he was before.* To say nothing here of the shocking language; the sentence does not contain even the shadow of argument. *God is not less governor of the world since he sent his son, &c.* who ever said, he was? Yes; *drunken infidels talk in that way.* But do infidels believe, that *God hath sent his son at all?* This makes them believers and unbelievers at the same instant. The absurdity is equally strong, when infidels are here suppos'd to talk of *God's arm being shorten'd, since Christ's coming;* when they disbelieve *God's arm being stretched out* before that event: and the reason is almost too obvious to be given—because infidels don't believe the Bible, and consequently not any particular Providence.

P. 11. *The world was like a city that has the plague in it, full of stench and corruption, arising from the poisonous exhalations of SOULS dead in trespasses and sins!*

P. 12. *What ailed thee, O Sinai*—Having enumerated (what he calls) the Scripture Earthquakes, he now asserts, that the cause of each was *Sin*. But the same answer is not given here, as in the other instances, because of the glaring absurdity—*What ailed thee, O Sinai?* SIN. Yet, tho' the writer has worded himself with some caution in this respect; the reasoning in this very place is surprizing. *Sin, says he, was the cause of the earthquake at Sinai.* How so? Because *Sin is the transgression*

transgression of the law. But, was the Law given *before* Sinai thus trembled? No. Was the Law then transgress'd *before* it was given? If not; how was this Earthquake (if it can properly be call'd an Earthquake) occasion'd by *Sin*?—Besides, the giving the Law was never yet consider'd as an act of vindictive Judgment; nor did the splendor and magnificence, at giving the Law, prove that the Israelites had then transgress'd, but were display'd in order the more effectually to secure their obedience to the Law then given, and to impress a lasting fear of their Almighty Legislator.

P. 13. Having told us (p. 11. that *all God's judgments, and therefore earthquakes, are punishments for Sin*, and having instanc'd in (what he calls) the Earthquake at the Flood, &c. he here speaks of the two Earthquakes at Christ's Death and Resurrection. But, can it be said with propriety, that the Earthquake *at Christ's Death* was a judgment or punishment for Sin? If not; this instance is introduc'd absurdly. And 'tis still more absurd, to apply the power of Sin, as the cause of the Earthquake *at Christ's Resurrection*; or to say, that the Earthquake, on that triumphant occasion, was a judgment or punishment for Sin; when *Sin and Death* were both vanquished and *swallowed up in victory*.

P. 14. *No one but his flesh creeps—no one but still thinks he feels the earth rocking under his feet: hears the shrieks of the inhabitants entombed in the ruins; beholds the water overwhelming all—views the smoke of the city, &c.* Strange sentences these, both in sentiment and expression! But does this author really think, *he still feels the earth rocking;*
or,

or, did *he* feel it, even on that fatal day? If not; why this amplified mode of expression? Again, did the water overwhelm *all*, or *the whole* city of Lisbon? If not; why must words be inserted without truth? And, what a strange combination of ideas is excited by reading, in one line, of Lisbon's being *overwhelm'd with water*; and, in the next line, of its being *all on fire*! The same sort of confusion must arise from the word *entombed*, which implies *death and silence*; and from *the shrieks* of the very inhabitants here said to be *entombed*.

P. 15. —*can assign no reason for God's not dealing with us, on that fatal saturday, as he dealt with them; seeing we are far, perhaps, from being more righteous.* Flat contradictions are not expected from writers of eminence. And 'tis surprizing, that this Gentleman should talk here, as if no reason could be assign'd for this distinction made by Providence; when he himself has expressly given a reason, in p. 18. where he makes Lisbon in ruins say to London in sin—*for transgressing the law of Jesus am I fallen, and thou standest by FAITH.*

P. 18. He seems here to be so struck with the propriety of making *Lisbon in ruins preach* (as he calls it) *a short but very full sermon to London in sin*, that 'tis no wonder he has made Lisbon speak very bad English, in addressing London, first with the pronouns *yourself* and *your*—then *thou*—then twice *you*—then twice *thy*—and then twice *thou*. At the bottom of this page, we read, *the second time thy palaces were all but down*; and the words *all but* distinguish'd for their elegance. But what
I would

I would chiefly observe here is, that he seems to make *the two Woes* in the text prophetic of the *two Earthquakes* at London, by saying—*the SECOND time thy palaces were all but down ! The SECOND Woe THEREFORE is past, and behold, unless thou repentest, the third woe cometh quickly.*

P. 19. Here (in contradiction to his former assertion of London's standing by *Faith*) he affirms, by way of question, that *the doctrines of the Trinity and Divinity of our Lord and Saviour are openly blasphem'd and ridicul'd, not only without discouragement but with encouragement.* In support of which general and dreadful charge, he pretends to produce two particular instances; which shall be here considered, in some proportion to their consequence.

The First is—*Has not a complaint against Arianism been follow'd by the preferment of the offender ?* an insinuation (without even the possibility of *certainty*) that such preferment was *the reward* of Arianism ! we have here then an heavy charge ; and tho' the person charg'd, as complain'd of, be not expressly nam'd, it is generally affirm'd to have been meant of *the Revd. Dr. Carter*. As I never saw, nor have had the least concern with, the Gentleman last nam'd ; I cannot be suppos'd to have any personal attachment to him : and only mean to shew by the following remarks, how weakly, how unfairly, he is here attack'd (if he be the person attack'd) by this *Hutchinsonian Zealot*. I presume, that the proper authorities on this occasion are to be found in *Dr. Carter's sermon* in August, 1752, and *Mr. Randolph's sermon* in October following, with *the preface* prefix'd to each of them. Mr.

Mr. Horne indeed pretends to no proof, and speaks only of *a complaint*. But how frequently are complaints ill-grounded ! and how censurable are imputations, without proofs, where imputations are of the least importance ! And what is the crime here said to be complain'd of ? Nothing less (according to this Gentleman p. 19.) than denying *the Divinity of Christ ; without which* (he says) *our Redemption is absolutely void, and we are yet in our sins, with the intolerable burden of the wrath of God lying upon us.* And yet—we have not only no proof of *the crime*, but no proof even of *the complaint* !

Mr. Randolph speaks in his preface (p. 4.) of *an anonymous Letter publish'd, which oppos'd the Divinity of Christ ; but who the author is* (he says) *he has no concern.* He speaks also (p. 6.) of *the Arian Heresy, as then openly vented at Deal* : but this may only signify, and most naturally refers to, *the Arianism vented in the aforesaid LETTER to the Corporation of Deal* ; especially, as Mr. Randolph does not, in any part either of his preface or sermon, expressly charge it upon *the Doctor*. The complaint therefore is charg'd upon *the Pamphlet* only. And of this Pamphlet Dr. Carter fully clears himself, in his own preface—*I know not, who is the author of that Pamphlet : I was not in any sort designedly an occasion of it ; nor had I the least intimation or expectation of it, till I saw it publicly advertised.*

Our author will now perhaps betake himself, in support of his rash imputation, to the circumstance of *not reading the Athanasian Creed*. This the Dr. has confess'd, and given his reasons in his sermon.

sermon. Amongst many other observations, he says (p. 18, 19.) *It is well known, that this creed is offensive to MANY ; and it would have been more agreeable to Christian Charity, if those, who could not suffer from the want of this creed (because a better, the Apostles Creed, is always us'd when that is omitted) would have been contented with the omission of it, for the sake of OTHERS, who cannot bring themselves to approve of it*—so that the Omission may have been *entirely* occasion'd by the objections of *other* people ; and by MANY and OTHERS the Dr. probably means a considerable part of his own congregation. But possibly the Dr. may think the damnatory clauses in this creed, tho' *lawful*, yet (according to an Apostolical distinction) *not expedient*. And even supposing, that he does not approve of these damnatory clauses ; is *he*, or is any man *therefore*, and for that *single* reason, to be pronounc'd *an Arian*?—I leave this point to the more mature deliberation of this young Divine : and only add one argument, which is fully decisive against HIM and HIS COMPLAINT, even upon his own principles.

Dr. Carter (in p. 24 of his sermon) *calls* CHRIST *the SON OF GOD*.

Mr. Horne (in p. 8 of his sermon) affirms, that the Centurion's *calling* CHRIST *the SON OF GOD* was *owning the DIVINITY of CHRIST*.

Therefore,

Mr. Horne must allow Dr. Carter to *own the DIVINITY of CHRIST* likewise.

E

Having

Having thus prov'd our author to be, even upon his own reasoning, *a false accuser* of one of *his brethren* ; I proceed to the second charge exhibited by him in the same page, which is express'd thus—*Have we not liv'd to hear of a guardian of Christianity moving the lay powers to expunge a creed out of the service of the church, only because it contains the faith he has subscrib'd to and sworn to defend; by which subscription to the Christian faith he holds the dignity that empowers him to move for its overthrow?* In answer to this solemn, but most uncharitable question, implying the affirmative ; the author will permit me to interrogate him, solemnly, in return.—Sir, as you have thus publicly accus'd one, whom you call *a guardian of Christianity* ; what authority have you to justify the charge ? You say, *you have liv'd to hear of it* ; but how ? Have you heard of it from any more credible testimony than the dark insinuation of *a News Paper* ? If not, are the guardians of Christianity to be openly arraign'd and insulted publicly *by you*, if at all, on an authority so precarious and unsatisfactory ? Can you, Sir, forget the Apostolical injunction, *against an Elder receive not an accusation, but before* (unless confirm'd by) *two or three witnesses* ?—But, should the fact be true ; what then is the nature of it ? A Prelate of the Church (suppose) moves for *what he thinks* an improvement in the Liturgy : and what then ? Has not every Bishop a right, or is he not (in your own word) *empower'd* to move for any such improvement ? Was not the present Liturgy compil'd by the Clergy, and establish'd

by

by King, Lords and Commons? And have not the same Powers, that made it, liberty to alter any part of it for the better? And may not the Lords Spiritual, or either of them, move for and recommend any such alteration? And if the motion or proposal should be thought expedient, and be enacted by *the same plenary authority*, which appointed the Liturgy in its present form; where, Sir, is the violation either of Episcopal duty or of Ecclesiastical obedience?—But you say, the Prelate mov'd *the LAY powers*. What! did he then object against *the Lords Spiritual*? Would he have excluded *his own Brethren* from any concern in it? If not, the exclusive term of *lay powers*, inserted here to aggravate the charge, is inserted wickedly. But, *what was the creed*, which he mov'd for the omission of? If the *Athanasian*; are *Christianity* and *that creed* so connected, that they must stand or fall together? You are pleas'd indeed to be very decisive, that he who moves for *expunging that creed* moves for *the overthrow of Christianity*. But, Sir, can you possibly think, (I appeal solemnly to your own conscience) that Christianity *could not be supported* by the sacred Scriptures and by the present Liturgy with the Apostolical and Nicene Creeds only? If you think, *it might*; the words *overthrow of Christianity* are likewise inserted wickedly. And if you think, *it might not*; consider with yourself, *when* this creed was first receiv'd into the Christian Church; and remember, it was not receiv'd *into the Church of England* till the 9th or the 10th Century.—But the capital condemnation is still to come. If you were sure, that a Prelate had made such a motion; are you,

can you, Sir, be sure what was his *inducement* to it? Would not every man of Charity conclude, that the motive was founded upon Religion, and a conviction of the usefulness of what he mov'd for? But YOU, in absolute violation of Christian Charity, and even in defiance of common sense, scruple not publicly to affirm, that the motion was not made from any principle of duty, not made from caprice or humour, but *only* (I am here astonish'd beyond the power of expression) *ONLY*, because it should *not* have been mov'd! YOU roundly pronounce, that the Prelate mov'd to expunge the creed *ONLY*, for *no other reason* but, because *he had subscrib'd to it!* YOU assert solemnly, before this University, that his Lordship *stood forth an Enemy*, *ONLY*, because he had *sworn to be a Friend!*

Sir—let me say with you, p. 6; *that person must never have open'd a bible to any purpose in his life, who does not see and know, that CHARITY is the very bond of peace and of all virtues, and that whosoever liveth without it is counted dead in the sight of God. And surely, if there ever was in man Uncharitableness; that dangerous, that unchristian disposition of soul is here display'd so powerfully, that no art, no cunning can so explain the writing as to excuse the writer. And therefore, notwithstanding your exalted pretensions to greater purity of Belief, you must now be contented to descend and sink into a state of the deepest humiliation; for St. Paul is very express, that if you have ALL FAITH, so that you could remove mountains, and have not CHARITY, you are—nothing. In short, as your pretended*
Zeal

Zeal for Christianity has hurried you on thus slanderously to asperse, and to represent as *accursed* (or, in your own word, *damnable*) One, whom you yourself call a *guardian of Christianity*; and as even YOU YOURSELF, Sir, CANNOT POSSIBLY BELIEVE what you have here *asserted* in this solemn sermon; the mind of the Reader will be led, almost necessarily, to that dreadful description of certain men given in Psalm the 59th—*Be not merciful to them, that offend of MALICIOUS wickedness: for the sin of their mouth and for the words of their lips they shall be taken in their PRIDE; and why? their preaching is of CURSING and LIES.* The Reader will please to recollect here a preliminary caution, laid before him in page 20. And it will be farther necessary for me to subjoin here—that, as I shall liberally receive from the *Hutchinsonian* Fraternity the names of *Arian* and *Deist*, or rather *Atheist*, (as their customary stile runs) only for the preceding remarks; so I think it my duty to satisfy every *charitable* Reader by solemnly declaring—I firmly believe, that the *Scripture doctrine* OF THE HOLY TRINITY (so far as I can understand a doctrine so mysterious and certainly attended with its share of difficulties) is truly expressed in the articles of the Church of England.

P. 20. *How far we of this place may go towards reforming the nation is more than any one can tell.* It will not, I presume, be so very difficult to determine this point (tho' not to the Gentleman's satisfaction) if by *We* he means here WE the followers of Mr. Hutchinson; who perhaps are the persons meant by the *disciples of their blessed Lord*, mention'd at the top of this page; and

and who may also be intended (in the next page) by *his faithful messengers, who are already arriv'd to prepare the way, but the world is determin'd not to hear them.* For, as to these *faithful messengers*, he could not know, that the world was determin'd not to hear God's *Judgments*; and indeed he says (in the preface to two extraordinary sermons since printed) that *these Judgments have produc'd some Signs of public repentance and reformation.* And, I shall only add, as to the preceding determination; that it must be rather easy to apprehend, that men cannot (in these days) preach the Gospel with any great success; if they are so defective in *Christianity*, as to want even the prime virtue of it, which is CHARITY; and if they are so defective in *human Learning*, as this author and many of his Brethren.

The proofs of such a charge, as to this writer, have been here laid before the Reader in great abundance; and tho' the number might be still largely encreas'd, yet I shall only add three instances more, from this page and the following; and with them, unremark'd upon, close this disagreeable catalogue—*O may we never read a hand writing upon the wall of heaven in the illuminated capitals of the Almighty!*—*Then shall the earth indeed shake and tremble, the very foundations of the mountains, exalted against the knowledge of Christ, quake and be removed, because of the wrath of God due to unrepented Sin!*—*O that we could sound the same truth thro' all the kingdoms of the earth, that it might resound to the regions of eternity, and strike for ever dumb the enemy and avenger!*

Thus

Thus have I gone thro' this Gentleman's sermon, and have noted some of the many great Absurdities that occur in it. And, as the particulars of it have been now consider'd, it may be necessary to add in general—that it not only *abounds* in an uncharitable furiousness, from which all Sermons, and particularly on days of Humiliation, should be entirely free; but that it is *defective* in what the solemn season principally demanded (i. e.) a particular application to private persons, earnestly and yet rationally pressing each of them to true repentance. An illustration of both the articles here meant may be learnt, to much greater advantage than from any words of mine, by an attentive perusal of *another* Oxford Sermon, that is the reverse of *this* in almost every article.

It was preach'd on *the late Fast day*, before *the Corporation*, at the judicious appointment of *Mr. Mayor*, and is just publish'd at the request of *Mr. Mayor* and his Brethren, by *the truly Reverend Dr. GEORGE FOTHERGILL*; who, in a style well adapted to the awfulness of the subject, has express'd every weighty and proper consideration; with so much *sound Learning*, and with so much *true Religion*, as are not frequently found even singly, and are united in very few men besides Himself. It must be here observ'd, that the preceding sermon by *Mr. Horne* was not preach'd before our University, on the day of the Fast; the Gentleman, appointed by *Mr. Vice-Chancellor* for that particular solemnity, being *Mr. Bailey*, whose sermon is not yet publish'd.

I shall

I shall now take my leave, at least for the present, not only of *the authors of the Three Sermons*, but of *the whole Society of Hutchinsonians*. I should be sorry, if I appear'd to these Gentlemen as *their enemy*, because I have here attempted to *tell them the truth*. Were the *Principles* of them all as rational and salutary, as I am convinc'd the *Lives* of *some* of them are serious and exemplary; I would most heartily join with those who should say, *We wish you good luck, in the name of the Lord: and, for my brethren and companions sakes, yea because of the house of the Lord our God, I would wish their Cause, as well as Them, prosperity.* But the same concern for the success of our Holy Religion, the same zeal for the honour of our University, which would *then* demand good wishes, seem *now* to demand—I will not say, demand the contrary; but—seem to demand, that all Christians and Scholars unite as one man, in order to discountenance such *contemners of sound Learning* and such *corrupters of genuine Religion*; and vigorously to enforce our blessed Saviour's exhortation, of being *wise as Serpents* as well as *harmless as Doves*.

My Protest is contain'd in this little pamphlet: and happy shall I think myself, if it be found to awaken the attention of *the Governors*, and encrease the caution of *the Younger Members* of This Illustrious University. And, to strengthen the probability of such good effects, I shall conclude with *Four Remarks*, each confirm'd by the words of some *celebrated Authority*.

Let the first remark be on the zeal of these Gentlemen, in decrying *human Learning, Reason* and *the light of Nature*—words held so detestable by the founder of This Sect, that in a book call'd *the Religion of Satan or Antichrist delineated*, he treats the duties taught by Nature and Reason as *the Religion of the Devil*. On this first remark then we may safely refer ourselves (as in duty bound) to *the Charge* of our present *Right Reverend Diocesan*; p. 11, 12. “Tho’ most parts of
 “ Learning (says his Lordship) will be useful to
 “ us, and all parts ornamental; yet—our principal
 “ Business must be, to obtain a thorough Acquaintance with the Christian Faith: first the
 “ Grounds, then the Doctrines of it. And the
 “ previous Qualifications for attempting this are,
 “ a due Knowledge of the Rules of right Reasoning, and of the Moral and Religious Truths
 “ which Nature teaches; of the state of the
 “ World in its earlier ages, and in that when
 “ Christianity first appeared. These Preparations
 “ being made, the great thing, requisite in the
 “ next place, is a diligent search into Holy
 “ Scripture.”

The second remark may be on the conduct of these Divines in publicly reflecting on all other Ministers of the Gospel. And here we may introduce the authority of *the late Bp. of London*; who, in his 4th Pastoral Letter, speaking of the *Methodist* teachers, says—“ There is one thing
 “ in their conduct, which it is hard to reconcile
 “ to *fair* and *ingenuous* dealing; and that is, their
 “ endeavouring to justify their own extraordinary
 F “ methods

„ methods of teaching, by casting unworthy re-
 „ flections on the Parochial Clergy, as deficient
 „ in the discharge of their Duty, and *not teach-*
 „ *ing the true doctrines of Christianity.* This is a
 „ heavy charge ; and, I hope, it is very far from
 „ the Truth. The success of Ministers, in the
 „ discharge of their Duty, depends greatly upon
 „ the good opinion of their People ; and they,
 „ who go about to represent them as *unable* or
 „ *unwilling* to teach their people aright, are so
 „ far answerable for defeating the good effects
 „ that their Ministry might otherwise have.
 „ Men, that profess a greater zeal for Religion
 „ than their Neighbours, should take care not to
 „ indulge themselves in such Liberties, as evi-
 „ dently tend to weaken and undermine that
 „ which under God is the *National Support* of it.”

The third remark is on the danger, that young
 Gentlemen will run, in giving heed to the solli-
 citations and embracing the notions of a Set of
 Men ; who, despising Reason and Learning, and
 indulging their minds in all the wildness of ima-
 gination and unbounded whim, make *Words* sig-
 nify what they please, turn *the plainest History*
 into *sublime Prophecy*, and compel *Sentences* to be
 oracular, in various ways, *with all such meanings*
as were never meant. Dr. Patten has observ'd very
 pertinently (p. 16, 30.)—*It is owing to the vain-*
glorious spirit of throwing a new and unheard of
illustration upon Scripture doctrines, that the bible
both of late years been made a stage, whereon theolo-
gical adventurers display their ingenious skill and
dexterity. And indeed *the new airy systems and*
fancied

fancied discoveries of these rising adventurers, their licentiousness of fancy in interpreting, and their luxuriant use of false and quaint Metaphors in expressing the Sense of Holy Scripture, will be thought by some very aptly chastiz'd, in the following quotation from the first book of the DUNCIAD—

Here She beholds the Chaos dark and deep,
 Where nameless Somethings in their Causes sleep.
 How Hints, like Spawn, scarce quick in Embrio lie;
 How new-born Nonsense first is taught to cry.
 Here one poor Word an hundred clenches makes;
 And ductile Dulness new meanders takes:
 There motley Images her Fancy strike;
 Figures ill-pair'd, and Similies unlike.
 She sees a Mob of Metaphors advance,
 Pleas'd with the Madness of the mazy Dance.
 All these and more the cloud-compelling Queen
 Beholds thro' Fogs, that magnify the Scene;
 And, tinsel'd o'er in Robes of varying Hues,
 With Self-Appause her wild Creation views.

Lastly, for fear the preceding quotation, however pertinent, should be deem'd by any too light for the occasion; and as it may be judg'd right by most men, that an Address, upon a subject of such consequence to Religion, should be concluded powerfully in the words of Holy Scripture

ture ; I shall conform myself to this opinion. And I shall beg leave to introduce this last quotation, by saying—That when I hear of Young Gentlemen, happily religious in their Dispositions and hopeful in their Abilities, profelyted by these boisterous but vain preachers to greater Knowledge and Truth, and Freedom from corrupt principles ; I am reminded of those emphatical words of *St. Peter* and *St. Jude*—THESE are Spots in your feasts of CHARITY, feeding themselves without fear : WELLS are they, without water : CLOUDS, that are carried about of winds : TREES, whose fruit withereth : raging WAVES of the sea, foaming out their own shame : wandering STARS, to whom is reserved the mist of darkness. When they speak great swelling words of VANITY, they allure those who were clean escaped from them who live in error. And, while they promise Them LIBERTY ; They Themselves are the Servants of CORRUPTION.

T H E E N D.





